

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

(219)

CWP-2919-2014

Decided on: April 06, 2017.

Satnam Singh Walia

.... Petitioner

Versus

CIC New Delhi and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. A.S. Walia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

None for respondent No.1.

Mr. I.S. Sidhu, Advocate, for respondents No. 2 and 3.

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

Petitioner has sought information pertaining to 23rd meeting of the Board of Governors, which was not supplied to him on the ground that the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors were still pending for final decision, as such under Rule 8 (1) of the RTI Act 2005, the agenda of 23rd meeting dated 13.03.2012 could not be supplied but subsequently the information was supplied to the petitioner, however, there has been delay of 150 days.

This petition has been filed by the petitioner claiming that Central Public Information Officer, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Sector 26, Chandigarh should be penalized as per Section 20 of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondent, I am of the opinion that it is a fact that there has been a delay of 150 days in supplying the information.

On asking of the Court as to what actual prejudice has been caused to the petitioner requiring compensation to be paid for the detriment suffered, learned counsel for the petitioner has inter alia submitted that decisions were supplied after these were implemented depriving the sister of the petitioner to a right to challenge the same.

After going through the record, it appears that there has been a reasonable cause for delay in supply of the information and no serious

prejudice has been caused to the petitioner except for the inconvenience of getting the information after 150 days.

I do not find any ground to penalize the respondents.

The petition is dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the respondents are required to be penalized in any case.

I have seriously considered the said contention of learned counsel for the petitioner in context to the objective of the Right to Information Act, 2005, which is as follows:

“An Act to provide for setting out the practical regime of right to information for citizens to secure access to information under the control of public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority, the constitution of a Central Information Commission and State Information Commissions and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.”

The prime object of the Act is not to punish the authorities and caused delay in furnishing the information. Besides this, the information having actually been supplied and no prejudice having been caused to the petitioner, no reasonable cause is made out to award any compensation or impose penalty upon the authorities.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

April 06, 2017

harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No